

**REMARKS**

Claim 1 has been amended. Withdrawn claims 19-36 have been canceled. The Application now contains claim 1. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this application and in other applications.

Claim 1 stands rejected under rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Savitzky in view of Rautila. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites an information input-output device. The device comprises a service provision unit that has a database relating to services that can be provided to a subscriber, and that “verifies whether a person trying to access the database is a subscriber who can be provided with the variety of services.” The device also comprises an input-output control unit that inputs “an authentication code identifying the person, the code being input from a portable terminal or a keyboard operated by the person.” According to claim 1, “said service provision unit determine[es] from the input authentication code whether the person is a subscriber, and when the person is authenticated by said service provision unit as a subscriber who can be provided with the service, said input-output control unit receives the data and then outputs the data.” Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references even when considered in combination fail to disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1.

For example, as set forth in Applicant’s prior amendment, Savitzky, in contrast to the claimed invention, teaches a Web agency allowing communications between a Web client and Web server. The Web agency is interposed between a Web client and a Web server to transform requests from the Web client prior to sending the requests on to the Web server (see Abstract). The Web client and the Web server are programmed to communicate with each other using a protocol such as HTTP (col. 5, lines 1-14). The Office Action acknowledges that Savitzky fails to disclose anything

about using an authentication code for the Web agency to connect to the Web server for security reasons.

To overcome this deficiency, the Office Action cites to Rautila as disclosing this missing feature. Rautila relates to a communication system including an information source (memory) 20, and a position transceiver 14 disposed at a broadcast location 16 and coupled to the information source 20 (see Abstract). The position transceiver 14 broadcasts information from the information source 20 within a broadcast area 18. The information includes identification information relating to the information source 20. The communication system also includes a mobile terminal 12 having first and second transceivers within the broadcast area, a network 42 communicating with the second transceiver, and a database 26 communicating with the network 42. The first transceiver communicates with the position transceiver 14. The database 26 transmits information associated with the identification information to the second transceiver when the database 26 receives at least the identification information transmitted from the mobile terminal 12 owned by the user via the network.

Rautila discloses encrypting information using a public key, which is the "signed" by the user of a mobile terminal 12 using a secret key. As set forth in Applicant's prior amendment, encryption using public keys and "signature" using a secret key, which is primarily used to protect a data transmission over a public line, is much different than determining whether a user is an authorized subscriber to a service. Thus, a "signature" is not the same as the claimed "authentication code."

Moreover, the scheme used by Rautila is described as follows:

the information is transmitted from the mobile terminal to a database and the transmission is signed by a user of the mobile terminal with a time stamp of when the information was

transmitted from the position transceiver to the mobile terminal to indicate the user's current location to permit database verification that the user is where the user should be.

Rautila, Col. 12, lines 39-46. Thus, Rautila is trying to determine where the user is and not who the user is. Accordingly, even if considered in combination with Savitzky, fails to disclose, teach or suggest allowing the user to enter an identification code such as a secret number to determine whether the user is actually the authorized holder of the claimed unit. Moreover Rautila, even if considered in combination with Savitzky, fails to disclose, teach or suggest allowing the user to output the data if the user is determined to be the authorized holder. Furthermore, the cited combination fails to disclose, teach or suggest an input/output controller, which is not owned by the user, that uses an authentication code to access the server.


Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is allowable over the cited combinations. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over the cited combinations. The rejections should be withdrawn and claim 1 allowed.

The Office Action has restricted out and withdrawn previously added claims 19-36. Although Applicant traverses this restriction, withdrawn claims 19-36 have been canceled solely to further the prosecution of the present application.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: November <sup>10</sup>~~9~~, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Gianni Minutoli

Registration No.: 41,198

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &

OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicant